

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/708,601 03/14/2004		Po-Chun Yang	ACMP0180USA 2600		
27765	7590 09/12/2006		EXAMINER		
NORTH A	MERICA INTELLECT	MASKULINSKI, MICHAEL C			
P.O. BOX 5 MERRIFIEI	06 LD, VA 22116	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
1,12,144,12,1					
			DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Supermone			10/708,601	YANG, PO-CH	YANG, PO-CHUN			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	,				
			Michael C. Maskulinski	2113				
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication of the commu	nication appe	ears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence	e address			
WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD IN THE NEW PERIOD IN TH	MAILING DA's of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. tatutory period will y will, by statute, or	TE OF THIS COMMUN 6(a). In no event, however, may a I apply and will expire SIX (6) MO cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of to BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	his communication.			
Status								
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <i>08 Au</i> c	gust 2006.					
•	•		action is non-final.					
,	•—							
<i>,</i> —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositio	on of Claims							
_		annlication						
•	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
′=)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3 and 6-10</u> is/are rejected.							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	✓ Claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are objected to.							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election requirement.					
Applicatio	n Papers							
	•	o Eveniner						
•	he specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/are			by the Evaminer				
-	Applicant may not request that any obje		·		a)			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including							
	he oath or declaration is objected t	_	·	• • •				
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	cknowledgment is made of a claim] All b)∐ Some * c)∐ None of:	for foreign p	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
. 2	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3	B. Copies of the certified copies	of the priorit	y documents have beer	n received in this Natio	nal Stage			
	application from the Internation	onal Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* Se	ee the attached detailed Office action	on for a list o	f the certified copies not	t received.				
	•							
Attachment(s)							
	of References Cited (PTO-892)			Summary (PTO-413)				
· <u> </u>	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	PTO-948)		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				
	No(s)/Mail Date		6) 🔲 Other:	·				

Art Unit: 2113

Second Non-Final Office Action

1. The indicated allowability of claim 2 (now independent claim 1) is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Rothberg et al. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rothberg et al., U.S. Patent 6,412,083 B1.

Referring to claim 1:

- a. In column 1, lines 53-60, Rothberg et al. disclose that present disk drive technology provides for EDAC (error detection and correction) to help prevent data loss (an application program containing an error checking algorithm in the electronic device, starting the application program to access the application data, and executing the error checking algorithm to check for errors in the application data).
- b. In column 5, lines 20-30, Rothberg et al. disclose that for user data file or a user installed application file, the user is informed that the file has a 'defective sector'. This may involve supplying the user with the name of the file containing the defective sector. The user is then asked if the file can be deleted and if the

Art Unit: 2113

user determines the file is not needed, then the host computer deletes the file (and erasing the application data if the error checking algorithm detects an error in the application data).

Referring to claim 3, in column 5, lines 26-35, Rothberg et al. disclose that a null value is written to the logical address and the disk drive performs the write and read verify operation, and then proceeds to other rescue-candidate locations (wherein the section of the memory is reset to an initial status after the application data is erased from the section of the memory).

Referring to claim 6, in column 1, lines 32-33, Rothberg et al. disclose a hard disk drive (wherein the memory is a nonvolatile memory).

Referring to claim 10, in column 1, lines 32-33, Rothberg et al. disclose that the electronic device is a computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colligan et al., U.S. Patent 6,298,443 B1.

Referring to claim 7, in column 1, lines 32-33, Rothberg et al. disclose a hard disk drive. However, Rothberg et al. don't explicitly disclose that the memory is a flash

Art Unit: 2113

memory. The Examiner takes Official Notice that a flash memory is well known and to implement a non-volatile device such as a hard disk drive with a flash memory is well known. Examples of this include memories in PDA's, cell phones, digital cameras and other devices that are too small to hold a hard disk drive but require a non-volatile memory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to use a flash memory in the system of Rothberg et al. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because a hard disk drive is not always practical especially in small devices. Further, storing and erasing of data is part of a flash memory just as much as a hard disk drive. To use a method for a hard disk drive with a flash memory requires nothing more than simple engineering and components.

Referring to claims 8 and 9, in column 1, lines 32-33, Rothberg et al. disclose that the electronic device is a computer. However, Rothberg et al. don't explicitly disclose a mobile phone or a personal digital assistant (PDA). The Examiner takes Official Notice that is well known to have computers or at least a processor and storage device in many different components. Examples include cars, kitchen appliances, large appliances, televisions, cell phones, and PDA's. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to computer system of Rothberg et al. in a cellular phone or a PDA. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because as mentioned above these devices contain at least a processor and a memory. It would be obvious to extend a method for a computer system to these types of systems.

Application/Control Number: 10/708,601 Page 5

Art Unit: 2113

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Maskulinski whose telephone number is (571) 272-3649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2113

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C Maskulinski

Examiner
Art Unit 2113